

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-32 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 14, and 21 being independent. Applicant amends claims 1-14 and 20-32 to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter. The original specification and drawings support these claim amendments at least at page 5, line 11-page 6, line 2; page 8, line 23-page 9, line 10; page 16, line 17-page 18, line 10. These revisions introduce no new matter.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §101 A. and B.

A. Claims 1, 14, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends claims 1, 14, and 21 as agreed during the interview and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §101 rejection.

B. Claims 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly failing to set for any steps involved in the claimed processes. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends claim 14 as agreed during the interview and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §101 rejection.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103 A. and B.

A. Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,887,141 to Trugman (hereinafter “Trugman”) in view of US Patent No. 7,027,975 to Pazandak (hereinafter “Pazandak”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting prosecution of the application, **independent claim 1** is amended as proposed during the interview and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 1 recites a computer-readable storage medium having computer-executable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer enable remote execution of a command, the instructions comprising:

receiving a command line instruction including a remote command, the remote command identifying a task of execution to be performed on a remote system;
initiating a session with least two remote systems;
assigning each session to an environment variable configured such that a plurality of commands can concurrently use the session by referring to the environment variable; and
causing the remote command to be executed concurrently on each of the at least two remote systems, including issuing the remote command to the environment variable, *wherein the environmental variable is a variable maintained by a local command line environment and the environment variable is further configured such that the variable is used to share information between processes or applications.*

Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer-readable storage medium is disclosed, taught, or suggested by Trugman and/or Pazandak, alone or in combination.

Applicant agrees with the Office that “Trugman fails to disclose that assigning each session to an environment variable configured such that a plurality of commands can concurrently use the session by referring to the environment variable” (Office Action, page 4). Pazandak fails to compensate for this deficiency.

Applicant’s specification explains that “[t]he administrator 112 is configured to establish a session between its local command line environment (also referred to as the “shell”) and any one or more of remote systems” (page 5, lines 15-17). Applicant’s specification further explains that “[e]nvironment variables 275 are essentially variables maintained by the shell that are made available to other tasks and are often used to share information between processes or applications. By assigning a session to an environment variable, different commands can make use of the session by simply referring to the environment variable. Also, since a single session can include connections to multiple remote systems, several commands can be issued by issuing them to a single environment variable, thus greatly simplifying larger scale (‘1 : many’) administrative tasks” (page 8, line 25-page 9, line 7).

In contrast, Pazandak is directed toward “natural language interfaces (NLI) for user interfacing with computing devices to interact with computer applications, for example, database programs, on such devices or interconnected devices, by inputting stated questions or commands in natural language, such as English language and grammar, to which the devices and applications respond” (column 1, lines 7-13). Pazandak discusses that “completion-based interfaces, such as grammar-driven menu-based restricted language interfaces ... are operable distributed among client and server elements” (column 5, lines 9-16). Pazandak also explains that “[t]his distribution enables ... supporting pluralities of users to simultaneously specify

pluralities of queries or commands interfaced to pluralities of devices and applications, including over a network or other distributed computing environment” (column 5, lines 16-21).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Trugman and/or Pazandak, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest an “*environmental variable [which] is a variable maintained by a local command line environment and further the environment variable is configured such that the variable is used to share information between processes or applications,*” as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 1.

Dependent claim 9-10 depend from independent claim 1, and thus, are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims also patentable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claim 1 are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Trugman and/or Pazandak alone or in combination.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejections.

B. Claims 11-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,887,141 to Trugman (hereinafter “Trugman”) in view of US Patent Publication No. 2003/0177187 to Levin (hereinafter “Levin”), further in view of US Patent No. 7,027,975 to Pazandak (hereinafter “Pazandak”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claims 14 and 21

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interest of expediting prosecution of the application, **independent claims 14 and 21** are amended along the lines of independent claim 1 and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicant explains above with respect to independent claim 1 why Trugman and/or Pazandak, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest an “environment variable.” Levin fails to compensate for this deficiency. Accordingly, Trugman, Levin, and/or Pazandak, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest all the elements of independent claims 14 and 21.

Dependent claim 12-20 and 22-32 depend from one of independent claims 11 or 21, respectively, and thus, are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims also patentable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claims 11 and 21 are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Trugman, Levin, and/or Pazandak alone or in combination.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejections.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious and that the claimed subject matter, is therefore, patentably distinguishable over the cited references. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of these claims.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-32 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,
Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: February 24, 2009

By: /Benjamin Keim/

Benjamin A. Keim
Reg. No. 59,217
509-944-4748

Shirley L. Anderson
Reg. No. 57,763
509-944-4758